

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	ATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/646,204 12/21/2000		Helena Seppanen	09910-007001	5981	
75	90 12/12/2003	EXAMINER			
Fish & Richardson			DO, PENSEE T		
225 Franklin St Boston, MA (ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	٦
			1641	12	_
		DATE MAILED: 12/12/2003			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>		· ·	Annlingtin	- No	Applicant(a)				
Office Action Summary		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)					
			09/646,20	4	SEPPANEN ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit					
			Pensee T.		1641				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commu or Reply	nication appe	ears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondenc address				
THE I - External after - If the - If NC - Failurian - Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD IN MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN IN STATUTORY PERIOD IN MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN IN STATE OF THIS CO	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.13 munication. 30) days, a reply statutory period wi y will, by statute,	6(a). In no eve within the statu ill apply and wil cause the appli	nt, however, may a reply be tim tory minimum of thirty (30) days I expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 October 2003</u> .								
2a) <u></u> □	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims									
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicati	ion Papers	.)							
10)	The specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objected the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected the specific or declaration is objected to be specifically applicable to the specific or declaration is objected to be specifically applicable to be specificable to be specific	e: a) acce ection to the c og the correction	epted or b)[drawing(s) b on is require	e held in abeyance. See ed if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120									
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.									
Attachmen									
2) Notic	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)				(PTO-413) Paper No(s) ratent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/646,204

Art Unit: 1641

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Newgrounds of Rejection(s)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 7-14, 15, 16, 17, 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins (US 5,705,628) further in view of Smith et al. (US 4,272,510).

Hawkins teaches a method of DNA purification and isolation using magnetic particles. The method comprises of incubating single stranded DNA and magnetic particles in a microtiter plate; Add 100 ul of binding buffer (20% PEG 8000 and 2.5 M NaCl) which corresponds to the surface tension releasing agent in the present invention and mix; magnetically separate the particles and remove the DNA to a new microtiter plate. The magnetic particles used were the carboxyl coated magnetic microparticles which were 1 um in diameter. (see col. 9, lines 20-30; example 4).

Art Unit: 1641

However, Hawkins fails to teach using a magnetic probe to separate the magnetic particles from the mixture and transferring the magnetic particles to the next medium.

Smith et al. teaches means for applying magnetic force to move antigen-antibody coated solid phase units from one place to another, i.e. from a predispensed reaction mixture to reaction mixture, into and out of large volumes of rinsing fluids and finally to test tubes or vials which are to be inserted into a gamma counter. The solid phase unit comprises a core of ferrous metal (core of magnetic material).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to use the magnetic separation device of Smith et al. to separate bound magnetic particles in the method of Hawkins because Hawkins suggests magnetic separation step and transferring the magnetic particles to a second medium/vessel. By using the magnetic separation means of Smith, the magnetic separation step of Hawkins' method would be carried out at a faster pace thus would save much time and effort and the particles can be transferred to as many vessels as possible. Also, by using such combination, a large number of solid phases units (particles) can be separated simultaneously under extreme uniform conditions, so as to yield highly reproducible results in solid phase assays with large numbers of specimen. Regarding the concentration the magnetic particles, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust such concentration to execute optimum binding between the magnetic particle and the target analyte.

Application/Control Number: 09/646,204

Art Unit: 1641

Regarding claim 17, one of ordinary skills in the art would find it obvious to add a STRAs in all the mediums through routine experimentation.

Claims 1-6, 9, 13, 14, 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Czerlinski (US 4, 454,234) further in view of Smith et al. (US 4,272,510).

Czerlinski teaches a method for separating magnetic particles. The rabbit anti-BSA antibodies, a given quantity (50 to 100 ul of BSA per 10 ml tube) of BSA-coated magnetic particles are added to a series of tubes. To each tube, a surface tension releasing agent such as a protein of rabbit antiserum diluted in PBS containing 2% (v/v) of normal sheep serum and 0.05% Tween 20 is added. The magnetic particles are collected with a magnet, washed with 4 ml of PBS containing 0.05% Tween 20. They are collected and resuspended a total of three times. (see example 3).

However, Czerlinski fails to teach using a magnetic probe to collect the magnetic particles and transfer them to a second medium.

Smith has been discussed above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to use the magnetic separation device of Smith for the magnetic separation step in Czerlinski's method because such as device would accelerate the collection of the magnetic particles and thus would accelerate the speed of the separation step so that results would be obtained at a faster rate since the method of Czerlinski requires that the magnetic particles must be collected and resuspended a total of three times. Regarding the

Application/Control Number: 09/646,204 Page 5

Art Unit: 1641

concentration of the tenside, one of ordinary skills in the art would be able to arrive at a suitable range through routine experimentation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pensee T. Do whose telephone number is 703-308-4398. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 703-305-3399. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communications and 703-746-5291 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Pensee T. Do Patent Examiner December 8, 2003

CHRISTOPHER L. CHIN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1800-/64/

Christoph L. Chi